

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CHRISTOPHER RADFORD, as an individual
and on behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

AERA ENERGY SERVICES COMPANY,

Defendant.

Case No. 1:24-cv-00921-KES-CDB
ORDER DENYING DEFENDANT'S
SUBSTITUTIONS OF ATTORNEY FOR
FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH LOCAL
RULE 131(e) AND (f)

(Docs. 10, 11, 12)

The Court has read and considered the filed Substitutions of Attorney Form AO-154 of Defendant Aera Energy Services Company to substitute Adam Levin, Gary McLaughlin, and Aharon Kaslow in place of Hope Anne Case, Kenneth J. Zielinski, and K. Barlett Jordan (Docs. 10, 11, 12).

The filings do not comply with Local Rule 131(e) and (f). The filings include electronic signatures for the party, former attorney, and new attorney, each bearing an “/s” followed by the individual’s name. This complies with Local Rule 131(c) for current counsel who is utilizing their individual CM/ECF account. However, as for the party signature and new attorney signature, all three substitutions (Docs. 10, 11, 12) are without attestation of current counsel acquiring authorization or possessing a signed original copy.

1 Local Rule 131(e) states that “[s]ubmitting counsel shall place the other counsel's signature
2 on the electronic filing by using ‘/s/ counsel's name (as authorized on __[date]__).’ Alternatively,
3 one counsel may obtain the original signatures from all counsel who are filing the document, scan
4 the signature page(s) only and file the signature page(s) as an attachment to the document with an
5 explanatory statement on the signature page of the filed document.” L.R. 131(e).

6 In pertinent part, Local Rule 131(f) states that, along with “/s/” followed by the non-
7 attorney party’s name, there must be “a statement that counsel has a signed original, e.g., ‘/s/ John
8 Doe (original signature retained by attorney Mary Roe).’” L.R. 131(f). “To be adequate,
9 electronically submitted documents must bear a ‘/s/,’ bear the person's name on the signature line,
10 and should state that counsel has a signed original copy.” *Hunt v. Cnty. of El Dorado*, No. 2:10-
11 cv-01367 JAM, 2012 WL 4862362, at *2 (E.D. Cal. Oct. 11, 2012).

12 Accordingly, it is HEREBY ORDERED that Defendant’s requests to substitute counsel
13 (Docs. 10, 11, 12) are DENIED without prejudice. Defendant may re-file compliant
14 substitutions.

15 IT IS SO ORDERED.

16 Dated: October 28, 2024


17 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE